



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,660	05/25/2001	Igor Davidovich Kushnirskiy	0007056-0213/P6298NP/ARG/	4544

7590 09/26/2003
J.D. Harriman II
COUDERT BROTHERS
23rd Floor
333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LOAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/865,660

Applicant(s)

KUSHNIRSKIY, IGOR
DAVIDOVICH

Examiner

Loan B Nguyen

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,5,8,10,13 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13 and 15 objected to because of the following informalities:

“XPCOM and UNO” – these term are not support or define neither in the specification nor in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamilton et al. (5737607) (hereinafter Hamilton et al.).

5. As per claim 1, Hamilton et al. teaches a method for remote inter-language method calling comprising:

issuing a method call from said first protocol to an intermediary protocol (e.g. col. 7 line 48-60 and col. 30-34), and

translating said method call from said intermediary protocol to a second protocol (e.g. col 7 line 61-67 and col. 9 line 42-54).

Art Unit: 2126

6. As per claims 6 and 11 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
7. As per claim 2, Hamilton et al. teaches a method of claim 1 wherein said first step of translating comprises: calling a proxy object (e.g. col. 10 line 39).
8. As per claims 7 and 12 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
9. As per claim 3, Hamilton et al. teaches a method of claim 1 wherein said first protocol is selected from the group of Java, XPCOM, and UNO (e.g. col.7 line 64).
10. As per claims 8 and 13 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
11. As per claim 4, Hamilton et al. teaches a method of claim 1 wherein said intermediary protocol is *Connect (e.g. col. 10 line 39-42).
12. As per claims 9 and 14 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
13. As per claim 5, Hamilton et al. teaches a method of claim 1 wherein said second protocol is selected from the group of Java, XPCOM, and UNO (e.g. col. 10 line 42-46).
14. As per claims 10 and 15 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Loan B Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0358. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30 PM.

Application/Control Number: 09/865,660
Art Unit: 2126

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Loan B. Nguyen
September 15, 2003



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100